



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/796,873	03/08/2004	Nathan Moyal	5087-080	2674

20575 7590 09/06/2005

MARGER JOHNSON & MCCOLLOM, P.C.
210 SW MORRISON STREET, SUITE 400
PORTLAND, OR 97204

EXAMINER


NGUYEN, MINH T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2816

DATE MAILED: 09/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/796,873	Applicant(s) MOYAL ET AL.	
	Examiner Minh Nguyen	Art Unit 2816	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 August 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's amendment filed on 8/2/05 has been received and entered in the case. The amendment and argument presented therein overcome the informality objections, indefiniteness rejections, and the prior art rejections based on Taketoshi, and therefore, these are withdrawn. However, the prior art rejections based on Martin are maintained for the reasons set forth below. This action is FINAL.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: lines 6-7, "said divider value" should be changed to -- one of said divider values --. Note that the term "divider values" on line 4 is plural. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3, 10-12, 15-16 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 5,686,864, issued to Martin et al.

As per claim 1, Martin discloses a phase locked loop PLL (figure 5) system including a phase frequency detector (PFD 104),

a filter (filter 110), a variable frequency oscillator (VFO 502), and
a feedback loop including a frequency divider (divider 106) that has several divider values (the divider 106 is programmable, column 2, lines 28-29), the PLL operating over a frequency range that includes a number of frequency sub-ranges (see the abstract), the center frequency of each sub-range being determined by one of the divider value (this recited limitation is met since the divider 106 is programmable),

said VFO having a variable gain profile (figure 6, the gain profile can be changed by signals SEL1, SEL2, SEL3, ...), the gain profile of said VFO being controlled by a gain control logic (the control circuit 114) which sets the gain profile of said VFO so that the gain of the VFO remains within a desired range as the operation of said PLL moves between said frequency sub-ranges (this is the purpose of changing from one range to another).

As per claim 2, this claim is merely a method to operate a PLL having the structure discussed in claim. Since Martin teaches the circuit, he inherently teaches the method to operate.

As per claim 3, this claim is rejected for the same reasons noted in claim 1.

As per claims 10-12, 15, these claims are rejected for the same reasons noted in claim 1.

As per claim 16, the recited gain control logic reads on the control circuit 114.

As per claims 18-19, these claims are rejected for the same reasons noted in claim 1.

As per claim 20, as shown in figure 5, Martin's VFO is a VCO.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2816

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4-9, 13-14 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 5,686,864, issued to Martin et al.

As per claim 4, Martin discloses a PLL having the structure as discussed in claim 1 wherein the PLL is operable over a wide frequency range (see abstract) but he does not explicitly disclose the range is from 2.4 Ghz to 2.48 Ghz as called for in the claim.

However, as held by the court, when a general condition is met, varying the range is not patentable. In this instant case, Martin's PLL has the same structure and operable over a wide frequency range, setting this range to a particular range is well within the level of one having average skill in the art.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to set the frequency range of the Martin's PLL to be available from 2.4 Ghz to 2.48 Ghz. The motivation and/or suggestion would be to enable the Martin's PLL to be used in an application which requires such a specific range.

As per claims 5-9, these claims are rejected for the same reason and motivation discussed in claim 4.

As per claims 13-14 and 17, these claims are rejected for the same reason and motivation discussed in claim 4.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 8/2/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Arguments related to the Taketoshi reference are moot because the rejections are withdrawn.

Regarding the argument that the applicant's invention uses a single VFO whereas the Martin reference uses an array of VCO circuits.

The PLL in figure 5 of Martin reference uses a single VCO.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2816

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Minh Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-1748. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday, Friday 7:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Timothy Callahan can be reached on 571-272-1740. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



9/2/05

Minh Nguyen
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2816